

should get its own house in order. We were told to cut back on our own production, and thus relieve the market of the great oversupply of beef.

Now we learn that a cutback in cattle numbers produced in the West and Middle West are likely to be replaced by an increase in cattle numbers from the Appalachian region.

If the steel mills of Pittsburgh and Chicago were shut down for lack of sales, would the Federal Government adopt a program of subsidizing the construction of additional facilities for producing steel elsewhere in the country, and then argue that it had created new jobs by doing so? If the coal mines of Kentucky and West Virginia were closed down for lack of markets—as some of them are, I understand—should Federal funds go to help their competitors? Of course not.

Certainly, the situation is the same for beef. New beef production artificially brought into existence in the Appalachian region must certainly displace a corresponding production of beef somewhere else.

Last year we were also told that these additional feeder calves and cattle from Appalachia would substitute for the imported feeders we now receive from Mexico and Canada. What an argument of sophistry that is. Feeder cattle have been imported from Mexico and Canada for a good many years. It is not because we could not produce enough stockers and feeders here at home. The number of beef calves and of feeder steers produced in this country has steadily increased but imports have continued to come in. In practice, Mexico and Canada will continue to send us their surplus feeder cattle and calves as long as our tariff remains low and as long as we place no other impediments in the way of such trade.

Increased supplies of such cattle from Appalachia will not displace these imports. Rather, this will simply add that much supply to the market and compete directly with our own feeders produced in other parts of this country.

It is regrettable that in the presentation of this amendment the issue is made to appear as a sectional conflict, as if one part of our country were opposed to the aspirations of another. If it does so appear, that is not the result of any deliberate intention on my part. Although the cattlemen of my State may be in competition with those of Appalachia or other sections, there is no animosity in our competition. To the farmers of Appalachia, we say, "We wish you well. You are welcome to compete with us, utilizing any means that your skill and your brains enable you to use, in our great American competitive system. We ask only one thing; that the competition be on a fair and equal basis."

Because this proposal is essentially discriminatory against the beef producers of other parts of the country, I ask that the Senate adopt the amendment proposed by me and eight cosponsors, and delete section 203 from the bill. If the program envisioned by section 203 is as sound, worthwhile, and fair as its supporters appear to believe, it is suggested that they reintroduce it as a separate

measure so that it can be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and there be studied, both as to its soundness from the standpoint of agricultural development and conservation, and also as to its effect upon the farm production and price situation, particularly of the beef cattle industry, in other parts of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Public Law 1021, 84th Congress, 2d session, which authorized the Great Plains conservation program.

There being no objection, the statute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 11833

An Act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "Sec. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(4) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(11) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem

appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm entered into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment in-

creases required under section 8(e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

Sec. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1, in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to see his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326(b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

Approved August 7, 1956.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly and that the rule of germaneness be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the hour is late. The time is at hand for the President to make a change in South Vietnam. I urge that our President replace Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, nominating Kenneth Keating, of New York, to succeed him in that extremely important diplomatic post.

I began to lose confidence in General Taylor when, as a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, I listened to his testimony as a witness before our committee, that the South Vietnam forces were winning the war against Communist aggression and infiltration from the north. He told of the then new military policy under the instruction of American military advisers of forming defensive compounds behind barricades, and that time after time the Communist guerrillas would attack some of these compounds and be repulsed and leave such and such number of dead; and the defenders suffered a fewer number of dead. Also, sometimes their attacks succeeded, he admitted. General Taylor testified that in this manner South Vietnam was winning the war against the Vietcong.

Frankly, Mr. President, I wondered at the time and I spoke out asking the ques-

tion: How could any nation win a war by keeping its forces restrained and simply waiting for the enemy to attack then claiming a great victory as they believed the enemy suffered more casualties than they? My view is that the only way the forces of South Vietnam can possibly win the civil war in which they are invaded by their Communist neighbors from the north, is to roll back the invaders by offensive tactics. However, Mr. President, General Taylor is a famed American military leader. I served for 37 months in World War II, most of the time in Italy and North Africa. I was never anything other than a civilian in uniform. Parenthetically speaking, I could never understand the tactics of our great military leaders in World War II invading Italy from the southerly part of the "boot" of that long, narrow peninsula and slowly fighting desperately contested battles over the rough mountain terrain, finally to Rome and to the Po Valley. It was beyond my comprehension why the 5th Army instead of landing at Salerno did not land on the side of Italy north of Naples, perhaps at Anzio and cut across Italy meeting our Allies coming from the other side. In the long history of the world Rome was captured many, many times by enemy armies, but the 5th Army with which I served in a humble capacity was the very first to capture Rome the hard way from the south.

Frankly, Mr. President, I take a dim view of generals, or former generals, serving as Ambassadors of the United States. The Founding Fathers, in writing the Constitution of our country, provided that in the United States of America, civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. It is, of course, for our President to determine who it is he wishes as Ambassador to South Vietnam. An Ambassador is the personal representative of our Chief Executive. Admittedly, the situation has gone from bad to worse in South Vietnam. In the Washington Daily News of last Saturday, January 30, there was published a most informative statement under the headline "Taylor Is Doing a Poor Job in South Vietnam," written by a news correspondent and columnist, Walt Friedenberg, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, returning from a half year in Saigon where he observed the entire situation in his professional capacity. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAYLOR IS DOING A POOR JOB IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Walt Friedenberg)

Is Maxwell D. Taylor doing a good job as our Ambassador to South Vietnam?

Granted it's like being captain of a leaking ship with a mutinous crew in a stormy sea, the answer, in my judgment, is definitely "No."

The 63-year old general, who performed with distinction as a soldier, has been unable to become an effective diplomat amid the complications and subtleties of Saigon.

He is the clean-cut American over his head operating in Asia.

He is too self-confidently dedicated to the official preset solution to the Communists' guerrilla war.

He is too insensitive to the curves and curlicues of Vietnamese politics.

TOO COOL

He is too cool and aloof toward the Vietnamese generals to become their confidant.

And in General Taylor, the United States has just about put all its Vietnamese eggs in one basket.

Since 1961 when President Kennedy sent him to Saigon for an urgent assessment, General Taylor has been the chief author of the plan.

Since July when he replaced the subtly effective Henry Cabot Lodge, General Taylor has been the executor of the plan.

And inasmuch as General Taylor has forestalled top-level visits by the Secretaries of Defense and State, only he can be the prime judge of his own performance.

HANDICAPPED

From the start, this West Point general was handicapped by his earlier associations.

His admiration for Maj. Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, the politically passé Chief of State, ran crossgrain to General Minh's arch rival Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, then Premier, who had dumped General Minh from real power but still suspected his ambitions.

The first Taylor-Khanh public clash came soon over the issue of infiltration from North Vietnam.

General Khanh insisted it was large scale. General Taylor, either because of unsound intelligence or instructions to keep the Vietnam temperature down in an election year, pooh-pooed General Khanh's appraisal.

Also in July, General Khanh publicly called for a "to the north" campaign, partly to deflect attention from his own failures, partly from conviction that American planes and warships ought to be brought into action. General Taylor again put General Khanh down.

INFILTRATION

As it turned out, the United States this week announced that 10,000 Communists infiltrated into South Vietnam in 1964. And General Taylor last November came around to advocating air strikes in Laos and North Vietnam.

Because of these differences, General Khanh did not take General Taylor into his confidence over a new charter he proclaimed in August.

The move roused Buddhists and students and these two factions toppled General Khanh.

To a large degree General Taylor is prisoner of the American idea that any problem can be solved if enough money, men, and machines are applied to it. This is patently not working so far.

General Taylor also has fretted unduly—as has Washington—about the legitimacy of any Saigon government, rather than its effectiveness.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at this time, we have 12 generals in South Vietnam. We have more than 20,000 men in our Air Force and ground forces in this unhappy civil war-torn country. I have reliable information that the situation there is now even worse than it was when we had but a few hundred military advisers instead of our present Armed Forces in excess of 20,000. Our forces over there are not headed like a conventional American Army with one or two generals but it seems more like the army of a Latin American Republic, top heavy with generals. There is a song in the night clubs of Saigon "O dear what

can the matter be, 12 generals and no strategy."

Mr. President, my view is that our President would manifest wisdom and judgment were he to replace Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor with Kenneth Keating, of New York. Former Senator Keating is not a military man other than that he is a general in our Reserves. I have already voiced the fact that I take a dim view of professional generals occupying high official civilian positions in our Government from the Presidency down. History demonstrates that in the main this has not worked out. Kenneth Keating is internationally known as a former Congressman and U.S. Senator knowledgeable in the foreign affairs of our country. He would have the confidence of the American people. That he is a man of good judgment and integrity, loyal to his country and its institutions, personable and tactful is unquestioned. He has the confidence of his colleagues in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and of high government officials with whom he, as a Member of the Congress, has had contact. It is our international policy that politics ends at the water's edge. Furthermore, the Communists of the Soviet Union and Red China have full knowledge of the actions of former Senator Keating at the time and preceding the time of the Khrushchev and Castro threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere back in 1962. Kenneth Keating, of New York, was an able U.S. Senator. I believe, Mr. President, that he would prove an exceedingly able Ambassador to South Vietnam.

May I add, Mr. President, that I have had no conversation on this matter whatever, directly or indirectly, with former Senator Keating or with anyone representing him.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has just made an altogether excellent speech on the problems of New England. While our problems may not be as acute or may not be a century old, as are those of Appalachia, they are still burdensome and full of pitfalls and problems.

I, for one, hope to see the establishment of a regional development program in New England with a subregional program that might include the northern part of the State of Rhode Island, northeastern Connecticut, and the southern part of Massachusetts. This is not so large an area as the Appalachian region, but there is misery, hunger, poverty, and illiteracy there too. I thoroughly congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on the initiative and forward thinking he has shown in this regard. I know that this idea has been germinating in his mind for many months. I look forward to seeing its fruition as soon as possible.

With regard to the Appalachia bill now before this body, it has been the subject of long, painstaking hearings and careful draftsmanship, tailoring legislation to meet the specific and unique economic needs of that region. It is a sound bill, which should set the guidelines for future regional plans. No area, no land, no region is an island unto itself; and for this reason I intend to support the Appalachia bill.

I commend the excellent work that has been done by the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. McNAMARA] and the principal sponsor of the bill [Mr. RANDOLPH]. They have taken the lead in promoting a philosophy of regional economic planning and development which I would like to see gain national acceptance.

But I reiterate that my own region of New England, which for generations had enjoyed a high climate of prosperous industrial advance, widespread trade, important commercial fisheries, developed natural resources and specialized agricultural activities, has been experiencing in recent years serious economic dislocation. Each State in New England has specialized problems, but all of them can be met by cooperative regional planning because of our geographic and economic integration.

I ask such a plan for New England, just as I fully support one to meet the needs of the people and industries of Appalachia. I am confident that our State officials will cooperate in developing a regional plan specifically geared to the character of New England.

My hope is that the near future will see New England returned to its position as a leader in industry and commerce. I intend to do all I can to see this objective reached. I am pleased to see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] take the lead he has taken in this matter.

THE HUMANITIES AND THE ARTS— ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD BEFORE THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently in New York City, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, Representative WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, spoke on the subject of the humanities and the arts.

This address sets forth in both meaningful and eloquent terms the need for a national foundation which would assist and stimulate the development of both these cultural areas, highly important to our national welfare and the future goals we seek.

As one who has introduced legislation with similar concepts in the Senate, I would like to extend my commendations to Congressman MOORHEAD for his informative and thoughtful presentation, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

Because I feel that this address is very pertinent to the legislation which we will be considering in this session of the Congress to advance our Nation's cultural progress, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Congressman MOORHEAD's re-

marks entitled "A Great Audience for the Great Society" be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A GREAT AUDIENCE FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(An address delivered by Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, New York City, January 21, 1965)

Walt Whitman: "To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

T. S. Eliot: "A religion requires not only a body of priests who know what they are doing, but a body of worshippers who know what is being done."

As I appear before you, in awe of you, in awe of the total learning represented by this distinguished group, I am reminded of the admonition by Alexander Pope:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian
spring."

It is a dangerous thing for me who has only tested, to appear before you who have partaken so deeply of the waters of the Pierian spring.

A little learning proved to be a dangerous thing for that Kentucky mountaineer named Joshua who pleaded not guilty before a very learned judge. When the very learned judge heard that the defendant's name was Joshua, he asked, "Are you the Joshua who made the sun stand still?" The reply came, "No, Your Honor, I am the Joshua who made the moon shine still."

A little learning also proved to be a dangerous thing for the repentant sinner who appeared before his priest and confessed that in the 20 years that he had worked for a building supply company he had stolen enough material to build a house for himself and even one for his son and daughter-in-law. The priest, who was shocked, said, "Son, you had better make a novena." The repentant sinner said, "OK, Father, if you've got the plans, I'll supply the lumber."

Dangerous though it may be to talk with this learned assembly about a National Humanities Foundation, I am going to make the venture, first discussing the political situation which this legislation faces and then discussing with you whether the arts, creative and performing, properly belong in, or whether they should be separated from, the National Humanities Foundation.

First, what is the general political climate in the United States today and, second, what are the specific political hurdles which the National Humanities Foundation legislation faces.

I come to you after having endured and enjoyed 4 days of a national political celebration—the inauguration of a President of the United States.

Before the inauguration some of the commentators surmised that it might resemble the inauguration of Andrew Jackson. They had not realized that the change in America inspired, or epitomized, by the late President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy has continued.

Let's look at the inaugural record. On Monday evening the President's special adviser on the arts—an office which, incidentally has been in existence less than 4 years—gave a reception for 50 persons prominent in the arts and letters. Here poets and painters, architects and historians, dancers and actors rubbed shoulders with and talked to Senators and Congressmen, Cabinet officers and members of the White House staff.

This was the political leadership of the country trying to indicate its awareness of the importance of the intellectual and cultural leadership of the country.

It was a tribute by the men of politics to the men of arts and letters—and, let me point out that the arts were not separated from the letters.

Later that evening there was a function—I can think of no other word—called the inaugural gala at which prominent persons in show business—Carol Channing, Julie Andrews, Carol Burnett, and others—charmed a huge crowd. The tickets to the gala were free—distributed by the national committee to deserving political workers. Despite the great wealth of talent, this audience gave its greatest ovation to the ballet performance of Dame Margot Fonteyn and Rudolph Nureyev.

The highlight of Tuesday was a sellout concert at which pianist Van Cliburn and violinist Isaac Stern performed with the National Symphony Orchestra.

This was followed by a reception in the State Department at which the political leaders were given an opportunity to meet and welcome these artists to Washington.

But this froth of inaugural activity is not the only thing indicative of a change. Let us remember that on January 12 of this year when the President sent a massive \$1.6 billion aid-to-education message to Congress, the voices of opposition, so strident in the past, were almost silent.

Another straw in the political wind, of particular importance to this group as a sponsor of the Commission on the Humanities, is the fact that on the opening day of Congress, 57 Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills identical to my bill H.R. 334 to establish a National Humanities Foundation. As of now there are more than 80 similar or identical bills.

In the U.S. Senate there are more than 40 Senators cosponsoring legislation for a National Humanities Foundation.

In addition, there are at least three bills in the Congress calling for the creation of a National Arts Foundation.

I am convinced that there is a growing awareness in the United States that an imbalance exists in our educational system and in our commitment to culture. The Congress, I believe, is ready to do something to rectify that imbalance.

But even though the time is ripe for something like the National Humanities Foundation, that does not mean that the legislation will be enacted.

As you know, there are many pitfalls (or should I say pratfalls) between the introduction and enactment of legislation. One of the greatest of these is the danger that * * * infighting among the groups most directly involved and will tempt the Congress to say "A plague on both of your Houses, we will do nothing until you settle your own internal differences."

There is just such a danger between men of letters and men of arts.

It is not well enough recognized that while a National Humanities Foundation is broad enough to include the creative and performing arts, a National Arts Foundation is not broad enough to include the other humanities.

One of the questions which must be decided is whether all areas of creativity and learning which are not scientific should be gathered into one foundation or whether the creative and performing arts should be separated from the other humanities.

Politically, of course, it would be easier to obtain legislation for one foundation than for two and it would avoid and unnecessary proliferation of agencies.

At the present time, in the White House, a debate is going on as to whether the administration should support one foundation or two, and if there are to be two, what should be the order of priority.

If the decision is for two foundations, priority will probably be given to an arts foundation. Such legislation has been before the Congress for many years but until this year,

the only bill to create a Humanities Foundation was the one I introduced last August.

A decision for two foundations and priority for the arts would probably mean a delay in the enactment of a foundation for the humanities for 2 or more years.

If you agree that there should be no delay in establishing one all-encompassing foundation, I think that the 100,000 scholars you represent should make their voices heard.

From the point of view of the scholar, one foundation seems preferable. Almost everything that scholars study was produced by an artist. Should scholars limit their association with artists to dead artists? I think that most of you would agree that an artist should know something of the history of art. I submit to you that an art historian should know something of the actual work of creative painting.

From the point of view of the artist, the concern is expressed that in competition for funds, artists will be forgotten unless they have their own foundation.

I do not think this concern recognizes the political facts of life. With one broad foundation, charged with support of the humanities and the arts, artists will seek meaningful financial assistance from a board of 25 members, "eminent in the humanities and the arts." Humanists and educators, with their superior organizational resources and advantageous geographical dispersion will be in a better position, politically, to lobby for money. If there are two foundations, the artists will be left to lobby on their own for financial support—they will, in fact, be competing with the NHF for cultural seed money.

But we should be asking ourselves whether one foundation or two are better means of attaining the national goal.

The national goal is twofold in nature.

It is to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art or as President Johnson called it, "the love of learning and the capacity for creation."

Great creativity in the arts alone is not enough, the Great Society must have a great audience.

What do I mean by that phrase?

I mean that a great civilization, at least in modern times, must have not only great creativity, but great receptivity. To reach this goal, it is quite clear to me that an arts foundation alone is not enough. By itself, it cannot perform the function of increasing the exposure of the creative and performing arts, but this is to water unplanted soil. The arts and the humanities are only artificially separable.

The humanities not only give us what is beautiful to see or to hear, but they also teach us what to look for and what to listen for. And it is important that an audience know these things. A great civilization needs the man who communicates to us in paint—but it is a greater civilization which can understand that communication to the fullest. And that understanding inspires the artist to even greater heights of creativity.

I conceive it to be a central function of a National Humanities Foundation to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art in America—to develop a great audience for great creative artists. Let me explore more fully the ways in which the National Humanities Foundation might do this in the fields of the performing and visual arts.

Because New York City is the theatrical capital of the Nation, let us consider this first in relation to the performing arts. I have in mind two different varieties of ventures which the National Humanities Foundation could support.

The first type of program would have as its primary focus the development and cultivation of "the great audience." As Walt Whitman said of poetry:

"Poetry like a grand personality is a growth of many generations. To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

In this task, one has to begin somewhere, and I propose that a good beginning point is with traditional theater productions. I am not suggesting that the National Humanities Foundation mount a full scale Broadway production, but it would support efforts to bring established classics to broader and more diverse audiences.

Last summer, on the street corners of New York, for example, a troupe of young and enthusiastic players brought Shakespeare to a Harlem audience. Most of those in that audience had never seen a play before. Their initial bewilderment changed rapidly to approval and delight. Such an undertaking offers the theater a splendid opportunity to fulfill its traditional function of illuminating for its spectators unfamiliar corners of life; it also begins to develop the potential of a vast and as yet untapped audience.

In addition to the anniversary of the Magna Carta, we have been celebrating the 400th year after the birth of Shakespeare. Suppose that out of the wealth of acting talent in New York, there were organized several traveling Shakespearean repertory companies whose visits to communities would be coordinated with high school literature courses so that the students who had been reading and discussing Shakespeare in a humanities course would suddenly have it brought alive to them in a three-dimensional form by professional actors on the stage.

The primary objective of such programs would be to awaken a love for and an understanding of the live theater in the hearts of people throughout the United States.

However, there would also be byproducts beneficial to the theatrical profession. In addition to the opportunities it would offer to the underemployed acting profession, such a program might well bring into the open an acting genius whose talents might otherwise never have been discovered. We would hope that the immediate benefits of such a program in terms of jobs for members of the theatrical profession would be dramatic. But our primary focus in this type of venture, that of educating broad audiences to be willing theatergoers, will have the long-range product of developing the very large audience which is necessary if the theater arts and its practitioners are to flourish in this country.

I mentioned another type of program, which the National Humanities Foundation might appropriately support. I think the National Humanities Foundation could and on occasion would, subsidize a theatrical production thought to be of unusual merit without reference to the audience it would attract. The young performer, the experimental production, the untapped director, would be the primary object of such a program. They would be offered a stage on which to develop their craft, a way to obtain recognition of their talents, and also, of course, a way to earn a living in their chosen profession. The focus of these efforts could be actors' workshops, small theaters, or college campuses. For example, in a statement last year to the House Committee on Education and Labor, Walter Caro, the executive director of the Theater Guild-American Theater Society, said:

"Just the other day I attended a production of a new play which could not be produced on Broadway, but for which we finally persuaded the University of Michigan to appropriate some money in order to get the play on the boards. They sustained a loss. It is a new, important, and challenging work. It never would have come to light."

In a university setting, there would be the added advantage of an unusual opportunity to develop the powers of comprehension of the audience and increase their receptivity to the experimental and innovative productions which are the seedbed of future theater.